

**EXHIBIT 6**

**REDACTED VERSION  
OF DOCUMENT  
SOUGHT TO BE SEALED**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

\_\_\_\_\_  
WAYMO LLC, )  
)  
Plaintiff, )  
vs. ) Case No.  
) 17-cv-00939-WHA  
UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC.; )  
OTTOMOTTO, LLC; OTTO TRUCKING LLC, )  
)  
Defendants. )  
\_\_\_\_\_)

HIGHLY CONFIDENTIAL--OUTSIDE COUNSEL'S EYES ONLY

VIDEOTAPED 30(b)(6) DEPOSITION of WAYMO LLC  
by and through its Designated Representative  
ASLAN (SHAWN) BANANZADEH  
San Francisco, California  
Thursday, August 24, 2017  
Volume I

Reported by:  
MARY J. GOFF  
CSR No. 13427  
Job No. 2688513  
  
PAGES 1 - 235

Page 1

1 Trade Secret 25? 01:01:38

2 A No, I don't have any more details. 01:01:40

3 Q You testified that Trade Secret 2 incurred 01:01:44

4 a [REDACTED] cost for development. You also 01:01:47

5 testified that Trade Secret 25 incurred the same 01:01:52

6 [REDACTED] cost for development. 01:01:57

7 Is there any chance that costs of 01:02:20

8 development is being double counted between Trade 01:02:23

9 Secret 2 and Trade Secret 25? 01:02:26

10 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:02:29

11 A So one thing in -- in answering your 01:02:30

12 question, I think you said that my testimony was 01:02:33

13 that it costs [REDACTED] to formulate those two 01:02:36

14 trade secrets. 01:02:40

15 So I just want to say first that, like, 01:02:40

16 that's -- that's not my testimony. What -- what I'm 01:02:41

17 saying is that insofar is that an expert calculated 01:02:43

18 this, it's -- I'm showing the -- my testimony is 01:02:46

19 that in the years 2009 through 2015, those were the 01:02:49

20 expenses incurred. 01:02:54

21 With respect to your -- the -- the core of 01:02:56

22 the question or, like, the latter part of what you 01:02:59

23 just said of: Is there a double count, I don't 01:03:01

24 think I am technically minded enough to say whether 01:03:05

25 that is true or not. 01:03:10

1 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Do you understand that you 01:03:11  
2 were designated corporate witness, so you're 01:03:13  
3 supposed to do testify on behalf of the company 01:03:16  
4 regarding the cost of each of the alleged trade 01:03:19  
5 secrets? Are you not prepared to testify as to that 01:03:21  
6 today? 01:03:25  
7 A So -- so I'm -- I'm prepared to testify. 01:03:26  
8 And -- and I have been trying to testify about the 01:03:29  
9 numbers and the costs incurred by this program. 01:03:32  
10 I am not technically minded to say that a 01:03:37  
11 trade secret involved this cost versus that cost. I 01:03:39  
12 think that's a more expert-based formulation. 01:03:44  
13 And I'm not prepared or capable of -- of 01:03:49  
14 creating -- like, I'm not an expert, right. Like, 01:03:52  
15 my understanding is you -- you have expert reports 01:03:54  
16 on these kinds of things, and there will be a whole, 01:03:56  
17 you know, rigmarole around that. 01:03:58  
18 But I am prepared to tell you about what 01:04:01  
19 are the costs and what we have been discussing about 01:04:01  
20 what the expenses that we're showing in these 01:04:04  
21 various years. 01:04:07  
22 Q If I understand your testimony correctly, 01:04:08  
23 you're prepared to testify about the costs incurred 01:04:10  
24 by Waymo's self-driving car program, but you are not 01:04:12  
25 prepared to testify about the costs of each 01:04:19

1 Q What is the cost of developing Trade 01:20:40  
2 Secret 2, Trade Secret 25, and Trade Secret 90? 01:20:42  
3 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:20:46  
4 A So to the extent that the expert has 01:20:48  
5 surmised that development of that trade secret is 01:20:55  
6 something that is kind of program inception to the 01:20:58  
7 date that, again, this comes to, like, fruition or 01:21:02  
8 whatever you want to call it, it -- it is that 01:21:04  
9 1 point -- it is the spend for the entirety of the 01:21:08  
10 program from that inception to the date that that's 01:21:11  
11 cut off at, which is 2015 or '16, based on the 01:21:14  
12 spreadsheet. 01:21:19  
13 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Given that the entirety of 01:21:19  
14 the program cost from inception to 2015 is about 01:21:21  
15 [REDACTED], would it be fair to say that the costs 01:21:28  
16 of developing Trade Secret 2 is the same as the cost 01:21:31  
17 of developing Trade Secrets 2, 25, and 90 together? 01:21:35  
18 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 01:21:40  
19 A You're asking: Is -- is the cost of 01:21:43  
20 developing -- is the cost of developing one, the 01:21:45  
21 same as the cost of developing all of them? 01:21:49  
22 Q (BY MS. CHANG) All three of them that we 01:21:53  
23 just discussed. 01:21:54  
24 A I -- like, I don't know that I understand? 01:21:56  
25 Like, is the cost the same? I mean, I guess my 01:22:08

1 MR. MACK: Objection, form. 02:22:46

2 A So again, it -- what -- the -- the -- 02:22:47

3 the number represents the full program spend from 02:22:49

4 inception to the date of fruition, plus -- just -- 02:22:53

5 sorry. Just to make sure. Plus, the 510 Systems in 02:22:57

6 the various instances. 02:23:01

7 Q (BY MS. CHANG) Who provided the 02:23:04

8 information regarding when that trade secret came to 02:23:05

9 fruition? 02:23:17

10 A It -- I know that's the word I have been 02:23:21

11 using. Again, it's a nontechnical term, so I don't 02:23:23

12 know if that's the right one or not. And also, 02:23:26

13 given that I don't have that technical background, I 02:23:28

14 can't tell you that. 02:23:32

15 Q You do not know when each of the nine 02:23:49

16 trade secrets at issue had its development 02:23:52

17 completed? 02:24:02

18 MR. MACK: Objection, form; beyond the 02:24:06

19 scope. 02:24:06

20 A So I do not have a technical understanding 02:24:09

21 of that. I know that the cost numbers that informed 02:24:11

22 these, like, dollar amounts in the interrogatories 02:24:15

23 cover a period of time that I have discussed in each 02:24:19

24 of these preceding, like, answer -- questions and 02:24:24

25 answers. 02:24:26